

## REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claim 17 has been cancelled, while the claims have been amended for clarity.

Applicants believe that the above changes answer the Examiner's objection to claims 1, 6, 19 and 22, and the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2, rejection of the claims, and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-6, 10-17, 19 and 22, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,933,960 to Avidor in view of U.S. Patent 6,434,828 to Andrews, U.S. Patent 6,442,840 to Zucker and U.S. Patent 5,661,907 to Apprille, Jr. The Examiner has further rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Avidor in view of Andrews, Zucker and Apprille, Jr., and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,036,472 to Iderosa.

The Avidor patent discloses a shaving apparatus and method of shaving, in which a shaving head carries a plurality of blades each having a cutting edge for cutting hair in a cutting direction, a rotating element arranged in front of the blades in the cutting direction for raising hairs to be cut, and a second rotating element arranged behind the blades in the cutting direction for applying a medicant to the skin of the user.

The Andrews patent discloses an in-line razor device with twin pivoting heads, and further discloses stretching the skin by using front and rear guards which grip and/or smooth the skin from two directions.

The Zucker patent discloses an electric razor with direct contact roller-mounted blades.

The Apprille, Jr. patent discloses a razor blade assembly.

The claims are amended to clarify their recitations. In particular, claim 1 recites a body, a device for stretching skin, a guard, and "a handle attached to the body at a location of a pivot axis for enabling a user to exert pressure on the body, the location of the pivot axis resulting in a force component of the pressure exerted on the body being distributed equally between the device for stretching skin and the guard".

In the Office Action, it appears that Avidor is being used as the primary reference. However, in the Office Action, it is conceded that Avidor does not teach disclose "a device for stretching skin, the device being attached to the body behind said one or more cutting blades relative to the cutting direction."

To this end, Andrew is cited as teaching shaving devices having incorporated a skin stretching device having a front guard and a rear guard; and Zucker is cited as teaching 2 rollers that cooperate to stretch the skin.

Applicants submit, however, that in the subject invention, the device for stretching skin is capable of operating independently of the guard. Further, the 2 rollers of Zucker are the blades for shaving the hair.

In regard to Avidor, it is further conceded that "Avidor fails to disclose the force is distributed equally to the stretching device and the guard." Apprille is cited to provide that which is admitted missing from Avidor, however, it is respectfully submitted

that reliance on Apprille is misplaced because it discusses distribution among the cutting edges not "the device and the guard", as recited in the claims.

Moreover, claims 12 and 19 recite the roller being "driven in the cutting direction at a rotational speed that is greater than a speed at which a user moves the shaving head in said cutting direction". It is respectfully submitted that this is not taught, disclosed, or suggested in the presented prior art references.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Avidor, Andrew, Zucker, and Apprille. For example, these references do not teach, disclose or suggest, a shaving head that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis added) "a handle attached to the body at a location of a pivot axis for enabling a user to exert pressure on the body, the location of the pivot axis resulting in a force component of the pressure exerted on the body being distributed equally between the device for stretching skin and the guard", as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 19.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims are patentable and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. The dependent claims respectively depend from one of the independent claims and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-16, 19 and 22, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/  
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611